DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 067 210 RC 006 478

AUTHOR Patterson, Harold L.
TITLE A Comparison of the Experiences of Indians and Negroes in American Society.
PUB DATE Aug 68
NOTE 74p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *American Indians; *Cultural Differences; Disadvantaged Groups; *History; *Individual Characteristics; Legal Responsibility; *Negroes; Sociocultural Patterns

ABSTRACT

The paper presents a comparison of the experiences of American Indians and Negroes in the American society. The premise of this paper is that Negroes and American Indians have different backgrounds, different cultures, different aspirations, and different philosophies of life and that neither have been assimilated by the American society. As a result their problems are similar, but the cure is not the same because the cause is not the same. The subsequent divisions of this paper are devoted to discussions of the main characteristics of the Negro and Indian roles in the American society, a differentiation of their problems and goals, and some suggestions for an improvement of white relationships with the Indians--which may or may not be appropriate for Negroes. In addition, a bibliography and letters from Chester Babcock, Washington State Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, to Harold Patterson, Principal of the Taholah School, and from the Taholah School Board to Chester Babcock are included. (HBC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RECEIVED
MAR 30 1972
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

A COMPARISON OF THE EXPERIENCES OF INDIANS AND NEGROES IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

BY

HAROLD L. PATTERSON

AUGUST 1968

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		Page
I.	THE PRESENT REVOLUTION.	1
II.	THE BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM	3
	The Degradation of the Indian and the Negro	3
	The Negro in Historical and Social Perspective	7
	The Indian in Historical and Social Perspective	14
	The Two Perspectives in Focus	34
III.	THE FOREGROUND OF THE PROBLEM	36
	Differences Arising Out of Different Treatment	36
	Differences Arising Out of Different Contemporary Environments	44
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	49
	The Indian Speaks Out	49
	Categories of Alternatives.	55
	Areas of Response	56
BIBLIOGRAPHY		64
EXHIBIT A.		66
EXHIBIT B.		67
EXHIBIT C.		68
EXHIBIT D.		71

I

THE PRESENT REVOLUTION

The winds of social change are blowing strongly across the American continent. At times, as in Watts, Washington, D. C. and Cincinnatti, they have reached hurricane force. The Negro is reaching for a place in the sun which he feels has been denied him by the dominant racial majority. He wants economic, political and social power. He wants social justice, equality and acceptance. He will no longer wait for these to come; he is demanding them now. He is willing to destory the existing structure in part or in whole in order to restructure or rebuild a society in which the barriers of racial provincialism no longer can exist.

Because the Negroes are militant, and because they constitute the largest racial minority in the United States, this social revolution has taken on the character of a Negro revolution in the minds of most people. In terms of calling attention to the needs, rights, and concerns of racial minorities in our society, this is not bad. However, it fosters a tendency to over-generalize the problem.

Orientals, Latin Americans, and American Indians also have problems. These problems manifest symptoms which are often quite similar to the symptoms of the problem of Negroes. I speak of such symptoms as discrimination, alienation, underachievement, underemployment, economic dependency, etcetera. There is no question that these exist, but why do they exist?

Medically speaking it is not good practice to generalize symptoms and treat them. An M.D. can relieve symptoms, but he is duty bound also to examine the patient and diagnose. He has not done his job until he has isolated the infection and prescribed for it specifically. We all know that an aspirin can relieve a fever, but we also know that a fever can be caused by a variety of ills.

So it is with the social body. Massive aid to minorities to relieve symptomatic pressures may be indicated, but it is a serious error either to assume that temporary relief will cure the illness or that one treatment is specific for all the ills.

It is the premise of this paper that Negroes and American Indians have different historical backgrounds, different cultures, different aspirations, and different philosophies of life. Neither have been assimilated by American society. As a result their problems are apparently similar. But the cure is not the same because the cause is not the same.

The subsequent divisions of this paper will be devoted to discussions of the main charactristics of the Negro and Indian roles in our society, a differentiation of their problems and goals, and some suggestions for the improvement of our relationships with the Indians which may or may not be appropriate for Negroes.

II

THE BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

The Degradation of the Indian and the Negro

It would both beg the question and fan the flames of racism to blame the problems of Negroes and Indians categorically upon White men as such. We all realize that men and nations have been carried along the tides of change in such ways that we cannot always hold them responsible as individuals for what has happened. In some sense it seems likely that those of European origin are as much victims of the unfortunate aspects of their culture as others are.

The fact remains, however, that both Negroes and Indians now have unique problems which they did not have before they came into contact with Europeans, and which can be traced directly to the ways in which they were exploited by those Europeans. In seeking to isolate the essence of these problems, it will be necessary to deal with the dominant culture negatively. I do not apologize for this, but I want it understood that I do not reject the whole organism simply because I probe its weakness.

The problems of Indians and Negroes are based on the systematic degradation of these peoples, although it was done to both in different ways. Clyde Warrior, a Ponca Indian, describes the character of the degradation of the Indian thus: ...When a

> people is powerless and their destiny is controlled by the powerful, whether they be rich or poor, they live in ignorance and frustration because they have been deprived of experience and responsibility as individuals and as communities.

...If the Indian does not understand the modern economy it is because he has never been involved in it. Someone has made those decisions for him. "Hand Out" do not erode character. The lack of power over one's own destiny erodes the character. And I might add, self esteem is an important part of charater.

In the old days the Ponca people lived on the buffalo and we went out and hunted it. We believe that God gave the buffalo as a gift to us. That alone did not erode our character, but no one went out and found the buffalo for us and no one organized our hunts for us, nor told us how to divide our meats, nor told us how to direct our prayers. We did that ourselves. And we felt ourselves to be a competent, worthy people. In those days we were not "out of the system", we were the system, and we dealt competently with our environment because we had the power to do so. White businessmen and bureaucrats did not make the Ponca decisions, the Poncas made those decisions and carried them out. If we were rich one year, it was our doing and if we were poor the next, we felt competent to deal with that condition. Democracy is just not good in the abstract, it is necessary for the human condition; and the epitone of democracy is responsibility as individuals and as communities of people (Warrior, 1965).

The European majority deprived both the Indians and the Negroes of decision-making roles on similar grounds. The Indians had land, and the Europeans wanted that. The Negroes had man-

power, and the Europeans needed that to work the land. On the premise that both were ignorant, incompetent savages without potential to fill a meaningful role in a more sophisticated civilization, both minorities were denied any opportunity to adapt to the rapid change that was brought about by the European invasion of this continent. The devices that were used to subjugate the Indians were wars, treaties, and colonial rule. For the Negro it was kidnapping and slavery. The effects of these actions are with us yet.

There are four points which tend to be overlooked when modern Euro-Americans seek to atone for past wrongs by drafting quick "solutions" for these minorities. Firstly, as Clyde Warrier has pointed out, Indians (and I will include Negroes) were entirely competent human beings in harmony with their environment when they came into contact with our civilization. Secondly, the way in which we dealt with them effectively deprived them of that competency and closed the doors for them to adapt to the new way of life. Thirdly, it is impossible to change the pattern quickly. That which happened by a process must be reversed by a process. Fourthly, any solutions which are not arrived at with the full and unhampered participation of the minority involed are doomed to failure. "I might also add it is only when a community has real freedom that outside help will be effective. The lessons of the new nations have certainly taught us that. It was only when colonies in Africa and Asia had their freedom that economic help from France and England became productive. We can apply that lesson here in America to the local community

itself" (Warrior, 1965).

In short, when generations have been cast in a passive role in society it is not reasonable nor just to suddenly say "Lo, we have changed our attitude, we have decided that you are nice people after all, please come and join us in our great enterprise. Come and assimilate into our society". This simply will not take place, because (a) our society is not yet prepared to fully accept Negroes and Indians, although we are apparently moving in that direction, and (b) individual members of passive minorities cannot suddenly change their roles and move into our aggressive, competitive political, economic, and social structures with reasonable expectations of survival.

In keeping with the direction taken in my introduction, I have pointed out above that serious damage has been suffered in the personalities of both Indians and Negroes through their involvement with our society. If it were within the scope of this paper, I believe that I could also show that the majority has also suffered severe personality damage in this relationship. It is not possible to so deal with fellow human beings without coming under the curse of Cain. May I say, then, that the damage that has been done to human beings in this situation is the real problem. All else is symptomatic.

At this point we face the basic reality. Perhaps the best possible solution, if there is one, would be for the dominant majority to change their attitudes. But these attitudes have become so institutionalized that is is almost an impossibility to change them. Changed attitudes come only with deep

understanding of the viewpoint of the other, and in our society very few have time to identify with a minority to a point that real communication takes place. Perhaps the Negro militants who see this use it as their rationale for advocating overthrow of at least some of the existing structure.

One of the manifestations of our attitude towards Indians and Negroes is our feverish search for "solutions". There is an inherent condescension in this approach which does not escape the victims of our ready-made solutions. If it were a technological problem I am sure we could do it. But problems of human relationships do not yield to the technological approach. Human beings resent being treated like objects. May I suggest that Indians and Negroes neither want nor need solutions. They need only the freedom and the opportunities to apply their own native ingenuity to their problems as they did in the past. We might begin this process by starting to listen to them.

The Negro and Historical and Social Perspective

The Effect of Slavery upon the Aboriginal Culture

When African slaves were brought to North America they were ruthlessly plucked out of their familiar environment and social milieu and reduced to an animal-like state. The latter term is used advisedly, for, according to Kardiner and Ovesey, there was little difference between the slavery North Americans imposed upon the Negroes and the condition of domestic animals (Kardiner, Ovesey, 1966, p. 145). In their words, "The most conspicuous feature of the Negro in America is that his aboriginal culture was smashed, be it by design or accident.

The importance of this basic fact for the Negro in America cannot be overestimated. It means, in effect, that the old types of social organization and all their derivatives could not continue, but a new type of emergent adjustment derived from the new conditions would have to be established" (Kardiner, and Ovesey, 1966, p. 142). C. Eric Lincoln finds traces of African culture in some American Negro customs, such as the naming of children for the time of their birth. However, his conclusion is the same as that cited above: "In North America, the African family was virtually destroyed, and only the barest remnants of African culture survived. North American slavery shattered the African marriage patterns" C. Eric Lincoln, 1967, p. 76).

The Effect of Slavery upon the Nergo Race

It should be clear that when a people is so completely deculturated they are rendered helpless. Because the doors of revolt or flight were not open, the process of dehumanization of the Nergo was also implemented. It was through this dehumanization that a barrier was erected between the Whites and Negroes that emancipation could not erase. Through emancipation the Negro was granted nominal equality, but, "Emancipation' did not restore reciprocal emotional interaction between Negro and White on the basis of equality.... It is difficult to transform an object heretofore used as a vested interest into an object with whom you enjoy reciprocal emotional interaction. The White man has never made this shift in his own adaptation to the Negro" (Kardiner and Ovesey, 1966, p. 150, 151).

I question the use of the word "restore" in the above quo-

tation, because it seems clear that reciprocal emotional interaction never existed between the Whites and the Negroes during slavery on any meaningful scale. Mark Twain illustrates this when he relates the reaction of Huckleberry Finn to his own feelings when he found himself slipping into a warm, human relationship with "Nigger Jim". Huckleberry was shocked that this could happen to him, and he squelched it becuase he knew it violated the social ethic to which he was committed.

Perhaps a century of "emancipation" has brought the Whites and Negroes potentially closer to a true human relationship, but, as I have said above, the traditional relationship is so institutionalized that we are all victimized by it.

The Effect of Slavery upon the Negro Family

The family is an important consideration from several standpoints; (1) The Africans came from a culture in which the extended family, or tribe, was the basic institution. (2) The Negro familial pattern, whatever it was, was deliberately destroyed for utilitarian reasons connected with the institution of slavery. (3) The role of the male in the family is a key to the maladjustment of the Negro family in American society. These thoughts bear elaboration.

The extended family culture. Because the tribal culture is an extended family culture we can understand that the African Negro would be severely disoriented in a breakup of this pattern. "Ancestor worship was an essential element of African religious activity, and such worship is credited with having produced the solidarity of the American family. The tribe, or extended family unit, was so strong a force that the concept of extra-

tribal brotherly love was difficult for Africans to accept freely" (C. Eric Lincoln, 1967, p. 76). Lincoln also states that in South America and the West Indies, where the Negro families were not broken up so frequently, they have established patriarchal family pattern. This evidence indicates that the patriarchal family pattern is normal to them.

The breakup of the Negro family. It was contrary to the interests of North American slaveholders to permit their slaves to have organized family relationships. To do so would have interfered with the market value of slaves. Therefore "Marriage was not recognized; paternity was not recognized. Offspring became the property of whoever owned the mother" (Kardiner and Ovesey, 1966, p. 146, 147).

To a people whose total social and political orientation and loyalty was to the family, this dislocation could be nothing short of catastrophic. The individual conceivably lost all sense of loyalty and personal worth. Certainly this did not open the door for the Negro to transfer his loyalty in any basic sense to his White owner, nor to the political institutions which permitted this crime against humanity. If African Americans have subsequently developed any sense of loyalty or patriotism in America it is a miracle.

The role of the Negro male. The North American system of slavery made the male Negro a complete chattel. His paternity was not given the dignity which is accorded to a stud horse! For reasons of utility, the male was thus deprived of any sense of self-esteem or responsibility toward his mate

or his offspring. Familial devotion and affection were abrogated on the ground that they endangered the institution of slavery. The sex-role of the male was reduced to more gratification, without emotional fulfillment. He was denied a place in the family, even though the mother and child were allowed a minimal family relationship for the purpose of child-rearing.

Along with this deprivation, there entered the factor of rivalry with the White man for the Negro female. Although not always willing to recognize them openly, many White males found the Negro women sexually attractive (Kardiner and Ovesey, 1966, p, 147). This relationship could not always be devoid of emotional and affectional interaction. The result was that there followed a strained psychological relationship between the White and Negro males because the former had upsurped the prerogatives of the latter.

This is seen by some as a continuing barrier to the normal acceptance of Negroes into American society. White males became over-protective of their women because of a fancied threat of reciprocation by the Negro male. Thus the fear of miscegenation still remains as a major obstacle to the wholehearted and unqualified acceptance of the Negro into American society. It could well be that this fear underlies the resistance to integration of the schools in many sectors.

The result of the degradation of the Negro male is that the lower-class Negro family is typically mother-oriented. The mother is the provider and the protector, and the father tends to become powerless and anonymous. When one considers that White American

society is male-oriented, it can readily be seen that this imbalance puts the Negro male in an almost hopeless situation.

The Effect of Slavery upon the Individual Negro

I am indebted to Kardiner and Ovesey for a summary of factors which describe the impact of slavery upon the individual Negro.

> The psychological effects of the slave status on the individual were probably very complex; but a few features of this adaptation can be inferred with certainty.
>
> (1) Degradation of self-esteem.
>
> (2) Destruction of cultural forms and forced adoption of foreign culture traits.
>
> (3) Destruction of the family unit, with particular disparagement of the male.
>
> (4) Relative enchancement of the female status, thus making her the central figure in the culture by virtue of her value to the White male for sexual ends and as mammy to the White children.
>
> (5) The destruction of social cohesion among Negroes by the inability to have their own culture.
>
> (6) The idealization of the White master; but with this ideal was incorporated an object which was at once revered and hated. These became incompatible constituents of the Negro personality. (Kardiner and Ovesey, 1966, p. 149).

It is obvious that some of the factors which are described as symtoms of group disorientation would also impinge upon the individual. Of such are the destruction of the culture and the enchancement of the role of the Negro female. The destruction of internal social cohesion mentioned in (5) is a corollary to the tensions with the Whites which I have discussed above.

In fact, every deprivation experienced by individuals as a result of slavery has its corresponding impact upon the group

in ever widening circles. The "degradation of self-esteem" certainly resulted in a lowered level of aspiration for the family, the community and the whole society.

In 1948, Cox wrote:

> The cry that Negroes are inferior is an illusion; what is real is the fierce insistence by the White ruling class that Negroes do nothing which might lead either themselves or others to believe that they are equal or superior to Whites.... In this situation, even severe states of social pathology among the colored people may serve the implicit purpose of the Whties... In the United States a relatively illiterate, criminal, dieased base, poor and prostituted colored people serves by comparison as proof to the world that Negroes do not deserve the social opportunities available to Whites. This state of degradation tends to characterize the cultural life of the Negroes and to make it distinct from that of the Whites. It is, of course, in the interest of the ruling class Whites to keep it thus distinct. They seek, through myriad and powerful devices, to make the colored person, as a human being, ashamed of his very existence; indeed the accomplishment of racial shame is a psychological goal of the Southern oligarchs.... (Cox, 1948, p. 366, 367).

At the time Cox wrote, he felt that "There is comparatively little fear in the United States that the Negroes will use force in asserting themselves" (Cox, 1948, p. 369). But we know that the situation has changed greatly since then. "Burn, baby, burn" is a cry that strikes fear to many a White city-dweller today.

Encouraged by the Supreme Court and by the civil rights movement to believe that there is some hope yet that he may achieve equality in some form, it is not surprising that many Negroes have become activistic, and even revolutionary. Certainly the prime movers of the American Revolution had fewer grievances than American Negroes have.

While it is true that much of what is said above does not describe the conditions of Negroes in slavery, it also must be realized that the residual barriers which prevent Negroes from full participation in American democracy and the "pursuit of happiness" are based upon the same morality and rationale which justified slavery. If this final point can be granted, I am ready to explore the bases of the American Indian problem in our society.

The Indian in Historical and Social Perspective

The Indian and Salvery

Since the problems of Negroes and Indians are here being compared, and since we found the origin of most of the Negro's problems in his enslavement, it will be interesting to consider the relationship of Indians to slavery. The comparison may illuminate some basic differences between the two groups as they relate to modern society.

First of all it must be understood that Indians were not strangers to the concept of slavery. They enslaved each other on this continent before the advent of the White man. Nor can it be said that the Indians always treated their slaves with consideration. The Aztecs slaughtered them wholesale, as victims to their blood-thristy gods (American Hertiage Book of Indians, 1961, p. 77). The Nootkas regarded slaves as materail wealth,

and sometimes killed them to demonstrate their disregard of possessions. However, when Indian-owned slaves were allowed to live, their lives were not intolerable. They fitted into the general social structure as performers of menial tasks. Perhaps the following description of the lot of slaves among the Quinaults is representative:

> Although slaves were regarded as property, certain features of common humanity crop out in regard to their treatment. A slave worked for (and often with) his master at woodcutting, hunting, fishing, and so on. Female slaves gathered wood, carried water and cooked. To an undetermined extent the products of a slave's labor belonged to him. It was expressed thus: "A slave might be very lucky in his hunting or trapping. He might get more furs then his master would accept. In time he might buy himself free." Thus xackwe'aq saved up a surplus of furs two or three times the value of a slave. This he gave to his master. Then he, went home and his owner said nothing. Slaves were allowed to keep winnings from gambling, though they often gave them to the master as a matter of course. Slaves recently acquired were frequently sold or traded, but old servants of the family or those inherited from one's father were seldom disposed of (Olson, 1967, p. 97, 98).

Olson goes on to tell that Quinault slaves were sometimes permitted to marry, but they were killed if caught trying to escape.

Since the Indians were already on this continent in large numbers and since they were familiar with the slavery as an institution, we must raise the question as to why the colonists

imported Negroes. Perhaps the answer lies partly in the following description of the efforts of the Jamestown colonists to enslave Indians: "There was a short-lived attempt to use Indians as laborers, and hundreds of them were enslaved. However, they proved physically and psychologically unadaptable to large-scale farming operations, and many died in the fields" (Linclon, 1967, p. 77).

Perhaps Lincoln's explanation is too simple. It is difficult to conceive that people who themselves were accomplished agriculturalists and had demonstrated remarkable capacities for survival in a rigorous land were physically unable to adjust to the strain of plantation labor. I think the emphasis should be on the psychological side, and, I would add, on the ideological side. The Indians could not and would not accept the way of life which the Whites sought to impose upon them. They could be a slave to other men in their own culture but they would not be slaves to a system and a culture which was dominated by a ruthless drive for the accumulation of goods.

> The European culture that invaded the New World was infinitely superior to the culture of the Indians in the broad field of mechanics. In concepts of virtue, ethics, justice, and wisdom the two cultures frequently differed, but seldom widely.
>
> The one great Indian difference appears to have been rooted in the matter of property: The general Indian view (with exceptions) of cooperation in the use of property in common as against the general European view (with except-

tions too) of competition for the acquisition of private property.

This encouraged an appearance of classless freedom in Indian society, encouraged a strong group identity, and encouraged a prevailing interest in matters other than work....

"Indolence" is probably the most used single word in all the reports written about Indians from the Discovery to the present day. It is the key word for the White point of view. Why wouldn't they work? Why didn't they want to labor to acquire things? The European simply could not comprehend a view of life (at least for respectable men) in which this objective was not paramount.

The gulf between the Indian and White view of life was at its most unbridgeable in the region that became the United States, colonized by a people to whom diligent labor, thrift, Benjamin Franklin's admonition to "Remember, that time is money," became the highest virtues, and work was literally man's sacred calling....

This basic conflict in points of view helps explain some otherwise puzzling matters: why, for example, Indians were so seldom used as settlers or even as laborers in the Atlantic seaboard colonies. Colonizers ransacked central Europe and the savage backwoods of Scotland and Ireland to find the transport colonists, sometimes at considerable expense, instead of making any serious attempt to transform the Indians, who were already on the scene and

who are often described as being superior physical and mental types, into supplemental colonists (American Heritage book of Indians, p. 244-246).

The authors quoted above clearly present the cultural conflict which began with the invasion of the continent and continues to this day. The Indian ideology not only kept him from assimilating with the Whites as fellow colonists, it was also strong enough to make it impossible for the Whites to enslave him. It is this ideology which has also enabled the American Indians to remain a distinct people within our borders for centuries without such devices as sanctions against exogamy which have been used by other cultural minorities.

There is a common myth that the Indian is weak in character and that he is easily swayed to the opinion of another. This myth is fortified by the typical naivete' of Indians in economic matters which has made them readily exploitable. But this is a facade. The Indian will yield to another in any matter that is not of basic importance to him to avoid offense or overt conflict. But in matters which are important to him, such as kinship loyalties and the use of his time, he will die rather than change and he has done so. Apparently the Indians who were enslaved by the early colonists chose to die.

Indian Wars and Treaties

Since the problems of the Indians cannot be traced to slavery, as in the case of the Negro, we must look to other aspects of the history of our dealings with them to gain an accurate perspective.

The Indians had an experience which has been denied the Negro. When the intent of the European settlers was made clear; namely, the Indian rights to the land on which they dwelt and derived their livilehood would be overrun, the Indian fought for those rights. Endless stories of the "savage brutality" of the Indian wars have been recorded, and they will add nothing to the present study. Suffice to say that there is authoritative evidence that the brutality of the civilized "Christians" is just as blood-chilling as that which followed the war whoop of the Indian.

When the wars were ended and the Indians were finally overwhelmed, the problem remained as to what should be done with them. Obviously they were not willing nor adapted to intermingling with the society which had overcome them. Indeed, the Indians yet regarded themselves as separate nations, and the United States Government undertook to deal with them on that basis. Accordingly, treaties were signed with Indian tribes, including those which had not been at war with the United States, which have the same validity and effect as those entered into between any two sovereign states in the world.

"That treaties with Indian tribes are of the same dignity as treaties with foreign nations is a view which has been repeatedly confirmed by the federal courts and never successfully challenged" (Cohen, 1942, p. 33, 34). Furthermore, Cohen cites very strong statements in interpretation of law and opinions of the Attorney General which assert that the Indians, though subject nations, are absolutely sovereign as to their internal affairs, to hold property, and to exercise all sovereignty not

specifically removed in the treaties (Cohen, 1942, p. 34 and many other refs).

The implications of the treaties for Indians in their relationship with the United States cannot be over-emphasized. They have far-reaching legal, political, and sociological implications. Without controversy, these treaties recognized the rights of Indians to practice their own way of life, to live on what may have been reserved of their own lands, and, in short, to retain their identity as Indians. The Indians took these rights seriously.

The severe cruelties which were imposed upon whole tribes in forcing them to settle upon reservations which were removed from their traditional homes is another story. In a sense, the Indians were overwhelmed but never conquered. They refused to surrender their dignity as free human beings even though their land was overrun. They sealed this refusal in their own blood and the treaties are evidence that the United States conceded this point.

The Colonial Regime

As the continent was settled and the frontiers receded, the U.S. Government found itself with a problem with respect to the Indians. Many of the reservations were not capable of supporting the Indians which were confined to them. The Indians has developed an economy which depended upon the use of the whole land without depleting it. This economy could not support the Indians once they were confined to reservations.

Recognizing a moral responsibility with respect to these subject nations, the United States established a monolithic colonial structure to manage the resources and affairs of the Indians, to develop and educate their human resources, and to administer relief to the needy. This was named the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The necessity of having a Bureau to administer federal responsibilities to the Indians is not questioned here. What is important to recognize is that what we ordained for their good has become a burden to them also. Cohen says:

> The History of the Indian Service policies is the story of the rise and decline of a system of paternalism for which it is difficult to find a parallel in American History. The Indian Service begins as a diplomatic service handling negotiations between the United States and the Indian nations and tribes, characterized by Chief Justice Marshall as "domestic dependent nations." By a process of jurisdictional aggrandizement, on the one hand, and voluntary surrenders of tribal powers, on the other, the Indian Service reached the point where nearly every aspect of Indian life was subject to the almost uncontrolled discretion of Indian Service officials. In recent years there has been a marked reversal of these tendencies (Cohen, 1942, p. 12).

The paternalism mentioned above is a result of the ambivalence we have always had in our attitudes toward Indians. Fey and McNickle accurately portray this ambivalence by

presenting two points of view:

> It is not surprising that Indians should have mingled feelings about the government of the United States. For there have been, in the history of government-Indian relations, two clear lines of thought, inconsistent with each other, mutually hostile, the net result of which through the years has been to nullify good intention.
>
> In one view, that of Chief Justice John Marshall: "America was inhabited by a distinct people, divided into separate nations, independent of each other, and of the rest of the world, and governing themselves by their own laws." The opinion was written in 1832.
>
> For the other view, we choose one expressed forty years later by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Francis A. Walker: "There is no one question of national dignity, be it remembered, involved in the treatment of savages by a civilized power. With wild men, as with wild beasts, the question whether in a given situation one shall fight, coax, or run, is a question merely of what is easiest and safest." Walker elaborated on this point of view by commenting, "No one certainly will rejoice more heartily than the present Commissioner when the Indians of this country cease to be in a position to dicatate, in any form or degree, to the government; when, in fact, the last hostile tribe becomes reduced to the condition of suppliants for charity."

In the view of the extreme hostility of such a highly placed offical as Commissioner Walker, it would appear that

the Indian tribes must have fought their way to a very good bargaining position in order to negotiate treaties with the United States which, in fact, guaranteed their tribal sovereignties. Yet it is evident that Walker did not stand alone in his view, for we have reneged on our treaties with the Indians. Our conscience forces us to let the treaties stand, but our covetousness will not allow us to fulfill all we have promised in them. While providing many essential services, and while partially protecting Indian tribes from rapacious commerical enterprises even to the present day, the Bureau of Indian Affairs also exists to see to it that the Indians do not get control of their own affairs and interests to the extent that the treaties would provide.

A modern illustration of the above statement is seen in the Bureau of Indian Affairs policies with respect to the Quinault Indians. The Quinault Treaty states that "There shall... be reserved, for the use and occupation of the tribes and bands aforesaid, a tract or tracts of land sufficient for their wants within the Territory of Washington... and set apart for their exclusive use, and no White man shall be permitted to reside thereon without permission of the tribe and of the Superintendent of Indian Affairs...." When the Quinaults decided that they wanted to zone the Quinault Reservation in order to regulate land used by Indians and non-Indians, their attorneys found the legal basis for this action. Their opinion says:

> It should be noted that the soveriegn power of the Tribe extends to White landowners who seek to reside or do business within the confines of the reservation. The Attorney

General of the United States, 23 Op. A. G. 214, has ruled that: "The legal right to purchase land within an Indian nation gives to the purchaser no right of exemption from the laws of such nation... these nations (are fully authorized) to absolutely exclude outsiders or to permit their residence or business upon such terms as they may choose to impose....".

Similarly, the Solicitor of the United States Department of the Interior, 55 I. D. 14, has ruled that: "Over all the lands of the reservation, whether owned by the tribe, by members thereof, or by outsiders, the Tribe has the sovereign power of determining the conditions upon which persons shall be permitted to enter the domain, to reside therein and to do buisness...".

It seems clear that the Indians of the reservation still retain their "inherent sovereignty" unless "it has been specifically taken from them, either by treaty or by Congressional Act" 231 F. 2d at 94. In our opinion the Tribe's power to zone, as a part of that "sovereignty" remains since there is no act of Congress which has ousted the Tribe from its authority to regulate the use of the land within the confines of the reservation (Wilkinson, Cragun and Barker, private letter).

Bear in mind that the tribe was not attempting to use the powers to exclude non-Indians from the reservation, as they might, under the terms of the treaty. Rather, they wished to use them to regulate abuses which were already taking place

and which the Bureau of Indian Affairs showed no interest in checking. Nevertheless, when the tribe passed their zoning ordinance they waited more than one year for the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. When the approval came it was meaningless. The zoning ordinance was approved only on the condition that the County of Grays Harbor, in which the Quinault Indian Reservation is located, adopt an identical ordinance to be enforced "upon persons or properties within the reservation over which the County may have jurisdiction."

Thus the "sovereign power" of the Quinault Tribe to regulate reservation land usage by non-Indians was by-passed completely. This ruling said in effect: "You Indians can pass laws that affect your own people, but we do not trust you to regulate non-Indians within your borders." Obviously the Indian is still regarded as inferior to the non-Indians,even upon his own land. Private land owners have more control over their lands than Indians have over their reservations, regardless of who owns the land. Poachers and thieves take fish, game, Christmas trees, and shake boards from reservation lands with impunity because of the failures of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to enforce federal trespass laws on the Quinault Indian Reservation.

The individual Indian, though now a citizen of the United States, can do little with respect to his trust property without the permission of the local Indian agent. Indians have not been encouraged to develop these resources on the Quinault Indian Reservation, as witnessed by the fact that no developments exist

after a century of federal relationship.

The effect of this policy, only briefly illustrated here, is simply that the Indians, once fiercely independent, aggressive, resourceful and self-assertive in their own ways, have been unable to cope with the paternalistic system which holds sway over them. Until very recently they have not even been asked what they want in terms of education, economic assistance, exercise of tribal sovereignty, development of resources, and etcetera. Presumably this is on the assumption that they would not know what to say.

The result of this statement is that the Indians have become professional non-participants in our society. In typical Indian fashion they have said "this is your show, go ahead and run it." This is not pure negativism, or even passivism. It is their way of survival by waiting out the game. Their assumption is that when we have made all the mistakes it is possible to make we might come around to asking them to participate with them in a joint venture.

There is some evidence that that time has come. Indians have recently been asked to speak out on their problems and to ask for what they want. They have not been backward or tongue-tied. There is at hand a 425 page volume containing the statements of 29 tribes and bands of the Pacific Northwest to Commissioner Robert Bennett of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. (New Horizons, 1966).

The Social Implications

The sketch of the Indian position in society is not complete without touching upon the social implications of the history I

have described. Any fair reading of history will show that the Indian race was not typically hostile or anti-social. Upon the initial contacts they were most often friendly and helpful to the White strangers. Differences arose later, when the Indians realized what the presence of the Europeans meant. Whatever can be said to the contrary must be understood in the light that the non-Indians were invaders. Whatever judgment it made concerning the manner in which they resisted invasion must be made in terms of what other peoples do and have done when their homelands are invaded.

So it is today. The Indians are not anti-social. They have a minimun of prejudice against non-Indians, considering the humiliations they have endured. The aspects of their present life and their relationship to the larger soceity can be considered under several headings.

The Indian Reservation. To the Indian his reservation is not a ghetto, as some have termed it, at least not in a bad sense. Very recently I heard a non-Indian comment that it is a shame that the Indians are isolated and cooped up on reservations. I presented this viewpoint to an Indian woman who is a close friend and associate. Her comment was simple and direct: "The reservation is all we have left; will they take that away from us too?"

This points up the fact that there are positive reasons in the minds of Indians for living on a reservation. It should be understood that any of them are free to leave, for they have the same potential mobility as any other United States

citizen. Therefore, the ones who remain on the reserve are there because they want to be. Instead of regarding reservation Indians as a residue of a "once proud race", it might be well to look at the situation through their eyes. To them, the weak ones have assimilated. Those who no longer value their Indian culture and hertiage are the ones who have left the Indian community. That is their choice, but they no longer retain their full identity as Indians in the eyes of the community.

Many of those who have remained are individualists. They are not hiding from anything, nor are they living in the past. They are living a life which contains elements of the old and the new. They have control of the rate and the degree to which they will conform to the non-Indian ways, and this is as it should be. There are still some positive and very valuable aspects of Indian culture which they have preserved and will continue to preserve.

There is strong evidence that the White man wants the Indian to leave the reservation because he wants it for himself. He wants to absorb the Indians, so that he can take the last vestige of his great heritage. He wants to abolish Indian identity so that he can forget those embarrassing treaties and the equally embarrassing historical facts which made them necessary. He wants the Indian to forget his culture, because he is umcomfortable with the idea that someone yet lives with the idea that materialistic, economic, and technological competition might not be the very best way of life.

The Indian Society. The Indian society is traditionally a land-based one which holds kinship as its highest value. To the extent that the reservation provides an adequate land base, this society is still self-sufficient. I have not mentioned economics here, because to the Indian, economics is simply a matter of having immediate needs satisfied. They still do not accept the European tradition of social change as upward mobility by means of the accumulation of wealth or power. If they did, they would be caught in the complusive cycle of competing and gaining, and would lose their peace of mind. It is evident that the main reason that Indians have not migrated enmass into the mainstream of American society is that there is little there that they want. It is not avoidance so much as it is "live and let live."

If a White person comes into contact with Indians at any time or place he is not rejected forthwith. He may often be greeted with suspicion, or even ignored, but this is not rejection. The Indian is not demonstrative in social amenities, even among his own. If the non-Indian has prolonged contact with Indians, he will be accepted on his own individual merits, or rejected on his demerits. In my observation, the Indian people are slower to reject a person than most non-Indians. That is to say, they are more tolerant.

If some feel that reservation Indians are deprived because they are not more involved with non-Indians, the Indian might respond that this is a matter of opinion. The Indian knows for sure that he is fully accepted in his own society, and,

using this as a base, he can make whatever incursions into the larger society he feels are meaningful to him. On the other hand, he has experienced pressures to conform which he cannot tolerate when he is a minority in the non-Indian setting. This is often true in the schools.

Everyone knows Indians who have completely acculturated with Whites as a matter of choice. Intermarriage is not unusual, and, in the Pacific Northwest, at least, it is relatively free of social stigma. Therefore the Indian does not feel frustrated or blocked, as the Negro does, in the matter of his relationship with the White society. Indians are not concerned about any real or fancied limitations on their participation with society.

Like Africans, the Indians have an extended family, tribal culture. Unlike the Afro-Americans, the Indians have been able to retain this culture. Because much of the culture has been retained, the Indian people have not been disoriented to the degree that Negroes have. They know that they lived on this continent first, and were never driven from it. They have been contained but not conquered.

Lesser contends that Indian tribalism is strong and viable, and that it will not disappear until the Indians decide this for themselves, which may be never (Lesser, 1961, p. 9). The degree to which various details of the tribal cultures have been retained varies greatly. But even those Indians who seem most acculturated, such as the Cherokees, retain their traditional value system.

> Studies among the Cherokees of North Carolina, for example --considered one of the Five Civilized Tribes for more than a century--and among the Navajos of the Southwest reveal the same inner Indian feelings about the world and man's place in nature, the same non-competitive attitudes, the same disinterest in the American drive for progress and change.
>
> The changes these community Indians have made over time, taken all in all, seem selective. Some inner man resisted complete annihilation of self and identity and hold fast to values and attitudes acquired in a mother's arms and on a father's knee and chose from us some things of use but not others. They chose pricipally what we call material culture and technology and little of our sentiments and values and our philosophy of life. (Lesser, 1961, p. 3).

The Indian Family. Since kinship traditionally represented the highest and strongest loyalty to the Indian, it is a major criterion in judging whether his traditional value system still holds true. Without hesitation we can say that nothing that has happened to the Indian has changed his family loyalties. Again, the extended family rather than the nuclear family is the unit. Any degree of blood relationship constitutes a bond between Indian people which cannot be ignored nor erased. A "relation" is not only entitled to hospitality in the Indian home, but also, under certain circumstances, such as tragedy or financial reverse, he is entitled to almost anything the relative owns. This is because the

relationship transcends all material values.

With regard to the structure of the Indian family, modern changes have had some effect upon the tribal patterns. The strict exogamous marriage laws are no longer observed among the Northwest Indians. However, the custom of turning child-rearing over to a surrogate is still recognizable, although not systematic. In a certain sense the children belong to the extended family as much as to the immediate parents, as a joy and a heritage. This is partially illustrated in the following brief anecdote: "When a Jesuit priest reproached an Algonkin priest with the immorality of his people, saying 'You don't even know which of the children around you are your own,' the old Indian replied, 'I will never understand you Frenchmen--you love only your own children, but we love all children'" (American Heritage Book of Indians, p. 249).

The Indian Individual. As an individual, modern Indians often suffer from a sense of frustration and alienation. This happens most frequently when they are separated from the tribal community, or thrust into a situation with which they are not prepared to cope.

Pressures have been placed upon them to assimilate for generations, and some of these pressures have been cruel. Like the Negro, the Indian has been taught that he should be ashamed of his "Indianness". Overtly, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has tried for years to separate Indians from their culture. I have an account from an eyewitness that the Bureau, as recently as 1966, still punished Navajo children for speaking their own language on the premises of a Bureau boarding school.

The Bereau also practices a more subtle type of discrimination against Indians in squelching initiative and denying them opportunities to have more say in decisions affecting their own affairs, corporately and individually. I have discussed this above, in connection with treaty rights. Lesser also comments upon this subject:

> Tribal self-government...since its organization under the IRA, has suffered on a good many occasions from unwarranted government interference. When Indians asked for clarification of their rights under new tribal constitutions, superintendents were often too prone to interpret provisions in favor of their own authority and against that of the tribe. And when graft or corruption is alleged against tribal councils and administration officials all too often have intervened so eagerly that Indians have had little opportunity to work out democractic processes for themselves. Federal trusteeship can be operated without such abuses (lesser, 1961, p. 8).

Dr. Lionel deMontigny, Deputy Director of the Division of Indian Health, U.S. Public Health Service, Portland Area Office, and an Indian himself, is quite outspoken on the type of discrimination discribed above. Testifying before the U.S. Senate Sub-committee on Indian Education in Portland, Oregon in May, 1968, Dr. deMontigny said that the most severe form of discrimination which the Indian has to face is a low expectation of Indian capabilities. He added: "The overt kind of discrimination is the easiest kind for the Indian

people to deal with...I think the hidden kind, where they don't expect very much from you because you're an Indian is the most devastating kind of discrimination that exists". Paternalism, then, is a form of discrimination, by this definition, which is of the worst kind. Lesser feels, however, that paternalistic abuses are not inherent in the federal trust relation (Lesser, 1961, p.7). If this is true there is room for hope that the Indians could be liberated without being deprived of legitimate federal services.

Of course the Bureau of Indian Affairs is not the only entity which discriminates against Indians. The public school teacher or administrator who explains under-achievement of Indian students on the basis of their "background" is doing the same thing. Indians also experience discrimination in places of business and in mixed social gatherings. Unless the individual is secure in his own culture and society, this will erode his sense of self worth. When Dr. deMontigny said that Indians can handle the overt type of discrimination, he may have meant that the Indian who still has a strong identity with his own culture will not be badly hurt by mistreatment from without. People are hurt only when they expose themselves by caring what the outgroup thinks.

THE TWO PERSPECTIVES IN FOCUS

In this chapter I have discussed the Indian and Negro backgrounds separately, and in sufficient depth I hope, to provide an adequate foundation for my basic premise--that we must be aware of the differences between minority groups before

we start talking about solutions for their problems. In the next chapter I will compare the Indian and Negro backgrounds and spell out the differences as I see them.

III

THE FOREGROUND OF THE PROBLEM -- A STUDY IN CONTRASTS

It is very difficult to avoid over simplification in dealing with such complex issues as those under discussion. The mind of any serious student can reach out into so many areas of relevancy that it is also difficult to get at the heart of the problem. My plan, thus far, has been to select what I feel are the most basic areas of life and to discuss the Negroes and Indians briefly in these connections. I have no choice but to continue this pattern when it comes to eliciting and describing the contrasting elements in their respective relationships to society at large.

Differences Arising Out of Different Treatment

As we have seen, the White Americans succeeded in enslaving the African Negro and failed to enslave the Indian, though they tried. Admittedly the Indian had a much better vantage point from which to resist slavery, and this may be the crucial reason for his success and the Negro's failure.

In Chapter II I discussed some of the damages incurred by the Negroes through the imposition of slavery. Since the Indians avoided slavery, it would be quite easy to rationalize that the Indian also escaped these types of damages. This I cannot honestly do. I have insisted that when damage occurs the first step in repairing it lies in going to the cause. When one learns the cause of a problem he can then relieve in by removing the pressure. The following discussion will

be aimed at showing how similar problems in certain areas may require different kinds of relief because of their different causes.

Contrasts In Cultural Change

It was reported in Chapter II that the African Negro culture was "smashed" in the process of Negro enslavement. Therefore, the issue of cultural change is really not a proper subject of discussion with respect to the Negro.

By contrast, the American Indian, through successfully resisting enslavement, has retained a culture which remains as a bulwark of his Indian identity. The Indian culture has changed for two reasons. Firstly, a culture which is so brittle that it cannot change cannot survive unless it is backed by superior numbers and overwhelming power. The Indian always survived by adapting to his environment, and this is still true with respect to his culture. Secondly, by drastic methods, ranging from genocide to boarding schools, the invaders have been able to destory certain elements of many Indian cultures. Some Indian languages are not forgotten, much of the religious practice has been broken down the food gathering economy has largely been done away with, and so forth. Yet there are some very strong elements of Indian identity which remain.

Furthermore, there is a revival of Indian culture taking place,which, strangely enough, is being encouraged by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as well as by others. It is indeed, a strange testimony of bureaucratic inconsistency to see Indian arts and crafts, history, and customs being

studied with Bureau of Indian Affairs blessing in Santa Fe, while Indians are being punished for speaking Navajo in a boarding school less than two hundred miles from there. The sole point to consider here is that the Indians have a culture to change and to revive. The Negroes do not. Whatever the Negroes have as a culture cannot be a basis of unity and pride to them, because it is the result of a very negative experience. Perhaps this is the basis for demands by some Negroes that they be allowed to enter the American culture with no limitations imposed. Since they have been deprived of their former culture, it seems logical that they should be allowed full participation in the American culture. With respect to Negroes, there is a cultural vacuum to be filled, and tensions are building up to fill it.

Not so with the Indians. It has been pointed out already that they are in control of the degree of acculturation which they shall accept. They are not making any demands upon us for deeper penetration into the "great society".

Contrasts in Racial Issues.

It was not slavery alone, nor was it race alone that put the Negro at a disadvantage in America. It was a combination of the two. The animalization of the Negro in slavery was justified by race, in that racial differences were the basis of the rationalization that the Negro was sub-human. Subsequently, when slavery ended, the same rationale persisted as a justification for preventing his participation in American society. Witness this quotation from the resolutions of a convention in South Carolina

in 1887. "The black man is what God and Nature and circumstances have made him. That he is not fit to be invested with these important rights may be no fault of his. But the fact is patent to all that the Negro is utterly unfitted to exercise the highest functions of the citizen. The government of the country should not be permitted to pass from the hands of the White man into the hands of the Negro" (Kardiner and Ovesey, 1966, p. 151).

Certainly there were men, such as Commissioner Francis Walker, quoted in Chapter II who did not hesitate to characterize the Indians as "wild men", no better than beasts. But the point is that Walker's view did not prevail. The Indians fought until it was profitable for the United States to sign treaties with them as with equal men and nations, although subject nations.

It is thus seen that racial difference has been the tool which unscrupulous Whites have used, and still use, to rub the Negro's face in the dirt to an extent that has never been experienced by Indians. Humiliations? Yes! Atrocities? Many! Genocide? We tried it, but we simply lacked the advantage we needed to destroy the Indian as we did the Negro. Perhaps one disadvantage the Negro had was that he lacked the ability to die under the whip of the slavery as the Indian did! He lived, and his life became a mockery to himself and a reproach to us! May God deliver us all from the consequences!

I cannot leave the issue of race until I hit more squarely than this. I will state, on the basis of racial prejudice as it exists today in theseUnited States, that assimilation

is a possibility for the Indian any time he wants it, but it is not forseeable for the Negro! On the basis of race, and race alone, we say to the Negro: "You have your place, stay in it!" To the Indian we say: "Get out of your place; stop being an Indian and lose yourself in our culture."

A highly-placed government official told me recently that all the problems of the Indians would be solved by one four-letter word--L O V E. He spoke of intermarriage. I wonder what he would say about the Negroes' problems. A Senator of the Washington State Legislature stated in a meeting at the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction that "State policy should be directed at the eventual assimilation of Indians, even if this process requires different immediate goals" (Uglman, 1968). Since we also discussed Negroes at the Superintendent's meeting, I wonder why the worthy Senator did not include them in this statement.

The fact is that we are not honestly facing the issue with either group. The Indian is acceptable to us if he becomes "White". He does not care to do this. Some Negroes think they want to, but we won't let them.

"Integration" as a solution for the Negroes is a sheer mockery. It is another offer which we cannot and will not fulfill. To what end shall we cause a Negro child to mingle with White children in schools and get to know that he is not a true peer?

I declare that a Negro will not find the true heights of human dignity in our nation until he reaches a place of

spiritual, intellectual, economic, and political power within the framework of our system! That is partly how organized labor won its day, and it is the only thing that our thick-headed society can understand! If this be called "black power" advocacy, let him who will make the most of it! I only hope that it can come peaceably!

I trust that I have made it sufficiently clear that the Negro has had problems with "race" that the Indian has never had and never will have.

Contrasts in Family Patterns

There is no point in reviewing what has been said already about the impact of slavery upon the Negro family. I have also pointed out how the Indian family still exists as the greatest single bulwark in Indian culture against his forced assimilation. If we had wanted to do an intelligent job of breaking up Indian tribes, we might have done it by breaking up their families. Indian boarding schools represented a partial attempt at this, but, like many other things the Bureau of Indian Affairs did, it was bungled.

The result is that the Indian family stands strong, and the Indians are reproducing faster than any other ethnic group in America. Coupled with the factor of the Indian cultural revival, this could be a potent force. If North and South American Indians unified in some sort of a Pan-Indian movement, they might even outnumber the Caucasians! I wonder how Caucasians would fare as a minority.

Contrasting Responses of Individuals

On the individual level the Negro and the Indian may have

more in common than any other level. There are just so many human responses, and our capabilities of responding run along similar lines. I would distinguish, however, between overt and inward response as I will explain below.

To the extent that Negroes and Indians experience rebuffs, insults and other injuries, their responses will be negative. To the extent that they experience good human relations with members of other groups, their responses will be positive. Yet, I believe that it cannot be shown that the culture, environment, and training of the individual will dictate how he handles his reponses.

Bryde, in his study of the Oglala Sioux, found that the impact of the acculturation process alone produces "Alienation and anomie, with the resultant feelings of rejection, depression, and anxiety--it was seen that the Indian youth is alienated from himself and others. He is not effectively with his Indian heritage, nor can he identify with the hostile world facing him. He is, during the trouble years of adolescence, a "nothing". He has an extremely crippling self-image. He has no direction to his life, and he is lost." (Bryde, 1966, p. 191).

This description compares fairly accurately with conditions ascribed to Negroes which derived from experiences in slavery and its effects. It is an extreme case, perhaps not typical of Indians, even adolescence, but I have introduced it to show that the Indian is not immune to the trauma of change which is too drastic for him to handle.

But the responses described above are all subjective.

What are the overt manifestations? Bryde describes many of them in the terms of poor achievement in school. But most usually they will be masked by the traditional reluctance to expose one's inmost feelings which is a common Indian trait. Furthermore, the Indian can find solace in retreating within his cultural shell if the outside world becomes intolerable, whereas, in a sense, the Negro has "no place to hide."

I believe that this will partly explain the unwillingness of the Indian to participate in mass demonstrations, riots, and other civil disturbances. This, to them, is undignified, over-demonstrative, and out of context.

The basic difference between the indivial Indian and the individual Negro in handling intolerable tensions at this point in history will be this: The Negro will "act out" his tensions; he will defy and destroy structures which symbolize to him a system which is depriving him of his rights and priveleges as an American. He is deeply involved with that system, and he cannot escape this involvement, so he strikes out against it. He will find an outlet in joining a "movement." The Indian, when he reaches this point will turn his frustrations inward; he will embrace poverty, disease, alcohol, or any other lethal medium for fulfilling his death-wish. A few years ago this tendency was manifested in the Quinault community by a wave of teen-age suicides. This terminated abruptly after the establishment of the Quinault Tribal Community Action Program, and things have taken an upturn since then.

Indians know what it is like to fight wars, but they are not revolutionaries. They have had their wars, and they now look to other means of attacking their problems. Perhaps Chief Joseph spoke for many Indians when he said: "I will fight no more forever." It was a weary man who said that, but no coward. Therefore, the Indians resent being identified with Negro militancy, and they do not want to be drawn into civil strife. They have manifested their dissatisfaction by non-participation, and the whole impact and message of that method would be lost if they resorted now to the total involvement of civil strife. These facts should have a bearing on how we shall work with each of the two groups.

Differences Arising Out Of Different Contemporary Environments

One of the most significant factors in differentiating Negro and Indian problems is that Negroes are concentrating into cities, whereas Indians are typically related to rural areas. In a letter to the Taholah School Board, Chester Babcock, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction for Washington had this to say: "I have a strong feeling, and in this State Board and Mr. Bruno concur, that we must never confuse the problems of de facto segregation of Negroes in the urban centers with the character of the predominately Indian communities. The reason is obvious. The problems of the central areas in Seattle or Tacoma resulted from the immigration of Negroes into a predominantly Caucasian culture. In the rural areas, any segregation which exists grew out of the in-migration of

Whites into Indian communities." (Exhibit C)

It is extremely interesting that the same direction of social movement still prevails that caused the problems from the first. The Negroes are still being forced upon White society by circumstances beyond their control, and the Indian is still being invaded by the Whites.

Prior to World War II the Negro population in the United States was still concentrated largely in the South. Franklin says:

> During the war, there began the greatest migration in history of Negro Americans. Hundreds of thousands left the South for the industrial centers of the North and West. In those places they met hostility, but they also secured employment in aviation plants, automobile factories, steel mills, and various other industries.... They continued to move out of the South in such large numbers that by 1965 one third of the twenty million Negroes in the United States lived in twelve metropolitan centers of the North and West (Franklin, 1965, p. 915).

One needs only to read the current issues of the newspapers and magazines to know what is happening to Negroes in their new setting. They have gained political power, they have competed with Caucasians for jobs and housing, they have concentrated in slums or "ghettos", and they have become increasingly militant. This complex of problems has been given a name. It is "de facto segregation."

De facto segregation seems to be a rather scary problem to

urban planners and educational leaders in the Pacific Northwest. They cannot be blamed for seeking to avert violence that has broken out elsewhere in the nation. The reason I have characterized it as a scary problem is that it seems to have triggered a movement to produce hasty solutions which cast all ethnic minorities in the same mold.

In the fall of 1967 the Superintendent of Public Instruction took an ethnic count of the student populations of all Washington schools. One result of this was that the press came out with some impressive comments upon the fact that there are 24 "segregated" schools in the state of Washington (See Exhibit A after Bibliography).

The State Board of Education began action to pass regulations which would withhold certain funds from such schools, as a pressure instrument to force them to dissolve the concentrations of ethnic minorities in their student bodies. This, of course, produced a strong reaction among the Indians, who feel that the concentrations of Indians in reservation schools is a good thing. The all-Indian Board of the Taholah School issued a strong statement about this, which appears in the back of this paper as "Exhibit B". The issue was finally resolved by the action of the State Board in placing a proviso in the proposed regulation which excludes its application to schools educating Indian students.

However, there are some who are not yet satisfied. While it should be crystal clear that the problem of urban de facto segregation has nothing whatever to do with Indians, some

urban planners feel that the Indians would be slighted if they were left out of their city-based plans. Of this nature was Senator Wesley Uhlman's statement at Superintendent Louis Bruno's special meeting on de facto segregation on April 12, 1968. Senator Uhlman proposed to take all local choice out of what should be done to eliminate problems of de facto segregation. He recommended that the full power of State Government be used to impose a city-oriented solution to a symptom of an urban problem upon all schools in the state. In his address he said: "We should state that the powers of the State Board of Education, particularly the power to withhold state funds, should be exercised immediately to begin the alleviation of de facto segregation. We should go one step further and agree upon a date for the complete elimination of de facto segregation" (Uhlman, 1968, p. 2). I have already quoted the Senator's statement in which he questioned the wisdom of excluding Indians from the dubious benefits of this panacea (See p. 45 above).

It is apparent that Senator Uhlman either did not ask the Indians whether they wanted to assimilate, in which case he might plead ignorance, or else he knows they don't want it and proposes to assimilate them anyway. This, of course, is what non-Indians have been trying to do since Columbus landed. I must hold with Lesser, who has seriously studied this problem, when he says: "The freedom of Indians to become as non-Indians and assimilated as they wish cannot be the issue here. The Indians are citizens with the full rights of citizenship, and many have exercised their freedom to become completely Ameri-

canized. But there are many who want and need the freedom to be Indian within the framework of America. For them the existence of the community to which they belong is essential to that freedom, and some defined legal status of the community is essential to its continued existence" (Losser, 1961, p. 8). Since Indians already have the right to assimilate if they choose, why do people like Uhlman feel that the right to not assimilate should be taken from them?

I hope that someone can pursuade Senator Uhlman and others like him that it is time to stop doing things to and for minorities and start doing things with them. In short, a community has a right to be asked before its schools are "desegregated."

IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Indians Speak Out

Clyde Warrior, whom I quoted in Chapter II of this paper with reference to the Indians having been deprived of decison making roles, also said:

> I do not know how to solve the problems of poverty and I'm not even sure that poverty is what we must solve -- perhaps it is only a symptom. In a rich country like the United States, if poverty is the lack of money and resources that seems to be a very small problem indeed.... But of this I am certain, when a people are powerless and their destiny is controlled by the powerful, whether they be rich or poor, they live in ignorance and frustration because they have been deprived of experience and responsibility as individuals and communities (Warrior, 1965, p.3).

I am drawn to the three key words in Warrior's statements. They are decision, experience, and responsibility. Decision consists in deciding what to do yourself about a felt need. Warrior said the Indians did this in the past, but they are prevented from doing it now by the colonial regime. Experience is gained by acting upon your own decisions. Responsibility is being in the position of feeling the full consequences of your decisions, knowing that you have yourself to thank or to blame.

Warrior says Indians need this as individuals and as communities. I believe that he is right. When people, as individuals and as communities, begin making decisions they

develop local institutions to implement them. There is an heirarchy of communications involved here and some minority groups are so deprived that they cannot even communicate among themselves. But when a group or a community becomes convinced that there is something that they can do about problems and felt needs, they can and will get together and talk it over. Eventually these gatherings can be formalized as community clubs or citizens' advisory committee. These local institutions can then engage with the larger society in bringing resources to bear upon the problems and projects to be dealt with.

In this way a process of personal and group interaction is initiated which engenders communication and respect between equals. I am now speaking of the point where the community begins to reach outside its own circle for information and assistance. Race prejudice and cultural barriers cannot enter the picture, because the moment they do communication breaks down and the whole process halts. Thus, we are thinking in terms of a model which can function only in a free, democratic atmosphere. This is the essence of the American dream. We have withheld it from both Indians and Negroes, but we need do so no longer.

The first step in this process is to allow the community to identify its own problems. The second step is to develop the local institutions to formulate plans and begin seeking resources. The third step is communicating with resources people and agencies, and so on.

Taholah, Washington, on the Quinault Indian Reservation, is

is a predominantly Indian community which is at the third step. I have watched it reach this point. In my opinion, the greatest difficulty that the Indian community is having at this point is that of convincing bureaucrats and bigots that they have accurately identified and defined their problems, and that they have the potential of dealing with those problems competently. If they can overcome this hurdle there is no question that the resources will be available to successfully deal with the problems.

I must say that even in getting this far there has been a remarkable upsurge of community interest and vitality. It is as though dormant hopes have sprung to life; the sleeping beauty is now awakening.

Out of this experience I am prepared to assert that if we sincerely wish to enjoy a proper relationship with American Indians we must begin by providing an opportunity for them to enunciate their own needs and aspirations, and we must listen carefully. Commissioner Robert Bennett, of the Bureau of Indian Affairs did the first of these, as I mentioned before (refer to New Horizons in the bibliography), and he may have been surprised at the voluminous response he received. Whether he listened carefully remains to be seen.

What, then, did the Indians say when they spoke out at Spokane in 1966? Without attempting a comprehensive summary, I believe that I can lift certain recurring themes out of the report of this conference, and give a fair sampling of what the Indians said is important to them.

1. Treaty rights must be protected. This includes the traditional rights to fish and hunt in the usual and accustomed places, but it also reaches into the principles of self-government which the treaties guaranteed.

2. The tribal land base must be consolidated and preserved. Indians are becoming increasingly concerned as they see their land slipping out of their control through government policies which permit it to happen.

3. Tribal institutions must be developed as means of support for local self-governemnt, social and economic development, and protection from chaotic jurisdictional disputes with state and local governments.

4. Loans are needed for economic development of reservation resources. When it is understood that trust properties cannot always be used as collatoral for loans, it becomes clear that some other sources of working capital must be available if Indians are to be able to participate in economic growth.

5. Employment opportunities must be developed upon the reservation. The Indian people are willing and desirous that developments and small businesses be encouraged on the reservations, both by Indians and non-Indians, so that they can develop an economy which will contribute to their local needs.

6. Housing programs are requested. Again, Indians cannot obtain mortgages if their homes are on trust property, so special programs are needed. (Many such programs are now operating, and more are becoming available)

7. Improved, locally-oriented educational programs are

needed. Sometimes public schools tend to ignore the Indian students, and it is felt that much more can be done than is being done to encourage them in school.

8. Improved health services are needed. Since the 1966 conference a beautiful new health center was built in Taholah, and services have been expanded in other Northwest Indian communities.

9. A reduction of paternalistic, arbitrary control of Indian reservations affairs by the Bureau of Indian Affairs was earnestly requested by several tribes.

10. Discrimination against Indian tribes by State and local governmental agencies was charged. (I could find no complaint in the entire report about social or personal discrimination against Indians, so it is not a serious problem to them, as it is to the Negro.)

It can be easily seen that the Indians are mainly concerned about how to improve their lot in the reservation communities. They have no plans to move out into the mainstream of society. in order to capture some "golden fleece." Hiwever, if the Indian requests could be realized, there is no doubt that a very meaningful type of integration would be implemented. Through the self-development of resources and institutions, involvement in the democratic processes in education, business, government, and social life would be inevitable. How could such an earnest plea for opportunites of self-development be characterized as isolationist or provincial?

Yet there are planners --urban planners -- who believe that Indians should be pried off their land and forced into some huge, economic, social, political, educational mixmaster before they can become real human beings! They propose to use forced integration of the schools as one major tool to accomplish this. It will never work, because it is a symptomatic approach. It will never work for Indians, because it was designed to meet a symtom of a Nergo problem!

Categories of Alternatives

Yinger presents a very helpful discussion of the goals that are open to minorities:

> Perhaps the most important system of classification (of minorities)...is based on the long-run goals of the minority. Louis Wirth distinguished four such goals: assimilation, pluralism, secession, and domination. Many minority groups are divided on policy, but the primary theme may be: let us disappear as a group judge us only as individuals - assimilation; let us maintain our group identity, based perhaps on language, religion, or culture, as long as we give full allegiance to society - - pluralism; give us our freedom, let us establish our own society where we can practice our own way of life without hindrance--secession; we are weary of being dominated, and we shall do everything we can to reverse the present status arrangement, by militant means if necessary--domination (Yinger, 1965, p. 30).

Anyone who has followed the discussion thus far knows that the Indian vote is for pluralism. The ethnocentricity of the Indians has in no way vitiated their loyalty to the United States since they have become legal citizens. They have contributed tremendously to the total culture, and if they are given free reign to participate as they wish, the contribution will be even greater. Arising out of the ashes of the bitterness of the past there are brilliant illuminations of Indian philanthropy arising --philanthropy in the personal sense. I quote in part from a

letter written to me by an Indian friend. The letter happens to be written in jail: "Those happy, tender, adolescent and golden years are but a paranoid memory, but like the splendid, tall and aged evergreen forest that stood so gallantly along the river banks, they one day disappeared, and like other parts of a modern nation, advanced technology replaced the outmoded. I wish our people (to) conform to their present advancement in medical, building programs, and higher education... One dream I'll never let fade is to see the Quinault Reservation turn into a paradise for not one people, but all to see; that includes economic structure."

Areas of Response

With pluralism as the goal, there yet needs to be a structuring of our responses to the requests of the Indian peoples which I have pulled out of New Horizons. I shall list the general areas which are suggested by the ten major problems and needs which I listed earlier, and discuss some possibilities in the context of each.

The Cultural Problem

To initiate discussion, I shall quote from the statement which I presented to the Senate Sub-Committee on Indian Education at Portland, Oregon, on May 24, 1968: "The American Indians have a cultural background which is equally as diverse from Washington European culture and its American offshoot as those of the Orient. One reason why Indians have made a less satisfactory adjustment in our society than oriental immigrants

have is that we have asked them to deny and forsake their cultural heritage while learning ours. Understandably, they have refused to do this" (Patterson, 1968, p. 2)

Since I have been quite free with my own opinions in this paper thus far, I feel that the following statement by Striner will provide us with all that needs to be said here on the point of cultural conflict. He has a recommendations well worth heeding.

> In addition to the legal right of some form of separateness there is the question of the social obligation to be assimilated by the dominant and society. During the period of large-scale immigration to the Unites States, there was a widespread acceptance of the idea that the immigrant was under a social obligation to be Americanized. Although what was involved may not have been defined in precise terms, there was a broad consenus endorsed by the immigrants themselves that at least in the ordinary daily business of life "the American way" of doing things was to be the prevailing standard. This broad and generally useful concept of the "melting pot" became so much a part of our folkways and was applicable to so many people, that it is understandable that the small group of U.S. Indians was not recognized as constituting an exception. But the Indians and Alaskans <u>are</u> an exception because they did not choose to immigrate to what is now the United States; they had settled here first....
>
> The U.S. Indian has no old country. His old country is here. And it was here that he was confronted by the onrush-

> ing flood of a rapidly evolving technologically based human migration that was successful in creating its own stable society. In any social system the effort necessary to preserve the old ways is frequently heavily reinforced when they seem under attack from without. Thus, today, we can only speculate whether if the Indian had not been pressured so unthinkingly to give up his culture, he might not have actually done so in far greater numbers as a matter of choice.
>
> A major influence in perpetuating the current frozen sitution is the idea that the Indian has an obligation to be culturally assimilated, because this in turn, perpetuates the all-or-nothing idea that he must give up being an Indian if he is to have a chance to earn a share of the benefits of U.S. society. I believe that the logical action to get both parties out of this frozen situation is to separate the choice of job career and training from the choice of the extent to which the Indian wishes to adhere to his culture (Striner, 1968, pp. 297, 298).

With regard to culture, the Indians themselves do not verbalize much. However, the protection of their cultural heritage is implicit in every one of the ten requests which I listed. Striner's point that our insistence upon an all-or-nothing policy could have greatly retarded Indian acculturation is worthy of consideration.

The Sociological Problem

This is so closely related to the cultural problem that

it could be easily dealt with under that heading. However, I wish to deal specifically with the implications of the de facto segregation issue as it here concerns the Indians.

Integration an On-going Process. Those who see in the concentration of Indians in communities something to be feared or derogated ought to relieve their minds that this is no threat to anyone. Integration in the true sense still leaves room for pluralism, as discussed earlier. The Indians are not truly isolated, nor are they going to be more so in the future. As they are permitted to develop their own lands and resources they will become increasingly involved in every area of society. What is recommended here is that this process be regulated, by retardation if need be, to protect the Indian community from the disintegration which is inevitable with too-rapid change.

Integration No Panacea. It is of interest to note that even the Negroes, with whom the issue of integration rose to flaming headlines, are beginning to have second thoughts about it. I quote from a current national magazine:

> An important shift in Negro strategy and attitudes is now emerging out of all the controversy that has rocked Negro organizations in recent months. The shift is away from the old emphasis on civil rights and integration....
>
> Almost everywhere you find Negroes turning increasingly toward association with their own race. In some colleges, Negro students have demanded separate--rather than integrated--dormitories. In some neighborhoods the demand is for black schools for black children. What happened

to integration? The answer seems to be that large numbers of Negroes have decided that real integration is not possible of early achievement--and are beginning to doubt that it is really the answer to their immediate problems....

One answer comes from Norman B. Houston, senior vice president of a Negor-owned insurance company and former head of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in Los Angeles. He said: ..."Negroes are trying to build their own society, just as the Japanese and Jews did." Mr. Houston continued: "This separate black society can be a good thing. It will give Negroes the desire to learn. Negroes will want to gain knowledge of government and business problems. And once knowledge is gained, they will see that separatism is impractical...".

Even among those approving the idea of a black society, one Negro after another emphasized that it is merely a temporary tactic, a way of working toward ultimate integration (U.S. News and World Report, July 22, 1968, p. 30).

It will suffice to say that the Indians are way ahead of the Negroes on this point. They have been saying all along what the Negroes are just now discovering--after many broken skulls and costly experiences. Again, the thrust is toward pluralism, even for the Negroes.

The Economic Problem

The Indian requests are pointing very strongly toward economic aid. It is a very healthy sign that they are not

emphasizing increased services. It is true that helath services and certain governmental functions are not something which they can immediately provide for themselves. But with available capital and technical training and assistance, they believe they are ready to take over much of the development and management of their reservation resources. It would be wise to hear them.

President Lyndon Johnson had this to say in his speech to Congress March 6, 1968:

> The economic development of potentially productive Indian areas suffers from lack of base capital to permit Indians to take advantage of sound investment opportunities and to attract private capital.
>
> The Indian Resources Development Act, now pending before Congress, contains provisions to spark this kind of investment. The central feature of this Act is an authorization of $500 million for an Indian loan guaranty and insurance fund and for a direct loan revolving fund. These funds would:
>
> Provide the foundation for the economic development of Indian lands.
>
> Encourage light industry to locate on or near Indian reservations.
>
> Permit better development of natural resources.
>
> Encourage development of the tourist potential on many reservations.

I would only add one word of caution regarding the legislation which the President here recommends. There are still too

many strings on it which tie it to the arbitrary authority of the Secretary of the Interior and his underlings. The Indians will still have to get permission to go to the bathroom unless this is changed.

Educational Problems.

I have written other recent reports on the educational problems of Indians, and I wish to only list some of the recommendations contained therein to round out the present report. (Ref. Patterson, 1967, 1968).

The Community School. In harmony with all that has been said in this report about the values of preserving the Indian communities, I can sincerely recommend that a school which serves and is part of such a community can be a great asset in community development. If the school is locally controlled, Indians have a better chance of becoming involved with the school in the education of their own children. The concentrations of Indian students make it easier and more economical to develop the school curriculum around their unique needs. Furthermore, the school and faculty can serve as a catalyst for community improvement if the staff is willing to become involved in community affairs.

Bicultural Curricula. From their inception, most public schools have existed to perpetuate middle-class, Anglo-Saxon values. If schools are to promote the type of pluralistic society which I have discussed herein, and I think they should, then it is time to enrich the curricula with generous portions of the cultural heritage of the various minorities. As means of providing an atmosphere of acceptance for Indians within a school, this is

a necessary step. Furthermore, it will enrich the knowledge and backgrounds of non-Indians who are enrolled, to partake of the values of another culture.

Compensatory Programs. Because Indian children live in two worlds and have serious adjustments to make in school, it is necessary to provide certain types of programs within the school which go beyond the minimum, typical program. Lower pupil-teacher ratios, nursery schools, remedial classes, teacher-aid programs, and special types of books and teaching materials are some examples of compensation which we have found useful at Taholah.

Counselling and Vocational Training. One of the leading causes of the earlier dropout of many Indian students is the factor that many typical, college preparatory educational programs do not lead to anything which correlates with the future intentions of Indian students. They are often interested in finding a way of earning a living while remaining on the reservation. If the school program can be geared to provide vocational counselling, field experiences, and vocational training, there will be much sounder reasons for the Indian young person to stay in school than he has now. If school programs can be slanted toward economic developments as they occur in reservation areas, so much the better. In any event, education must be related to life in order to be worthy of the name.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Heritage Book of Indians. Alvin M. Josephy Jr., editor in charge. American Heritage Publishing Company, 1961.

Bryde, John F. The Sioux Indian Student: A Study of Scholastic Failure and Personality Conflict. Pine Ridge, South Dakota, 1966.

Cohen, Felix S. Handbook of Federal Indian Law. U. S. Dept. of Interior, Washington; U. S. Government Printing Office, 1942.

Franklin, John Hope. "The Two Worlds of Race." Daedalus, 94:4, Fall, 1965.

Kardiner, Abram and Lionel Ovesey. "The Social Environment of the Negro," The Disadvantaged Learner, Part I, pp. 141-160. Statem W. Webster, editor. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1966.

Lesser, Alexander, "Education and the Future of Tribalism in the U. S.; The case of the American Indian." Reprint from The Social Service Review 35:2, June 1961.

Lincoln, C. Eric. "From African Civilization to the American Civil War," Poverty, Education, and Race Relations: Studies and Proposals. William C. Kravaceus, John S. Gibson, and Thomas J. Curtin, editors. Boston: Allynard Bacon, 1967.

New Horizons, Indian Leaders Conference with Robert L. Bennett, Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Spokane, Washington. October 17019, 1966.

Patterson, Harold, The Taholah Community School: Report and Recommendations. Unpublished Report, 1967.

Patterson, Harold. Myth and the Modern Curriculum, Unpublished Report, 1968.

Striner, Herbert E. Toward a Fundamental Program for the Training, Employment, and Economic Equality of the American Indian. Kalamazoo, Michigan: W. E. UpJohn Institute for Employment Research, 1968.

Uhlman, Wesley C. Reconsideration of State Board of Education Regulation on De Facto Segregation. Address given by Senator Uhlman before a conference called by Louis Bruno, Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction, to study problems of de facto segregation. April 12, 1968 mimeographed.

U. S. News and World Report, July 22, 1968

Warrior, Clyde. " Poverty, Community, and Power." Mimeograph, reproduced from New University Thought, Summer 1965, by permission.

Yinger, J. Milton. A Minority Group in American Society. New York: McGraw Hill, 1965.

STATE OF WASHINGTON

SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

LOUIS BRUNO
STATE SUPERINTENDENT

OLYMPIA

January 3, 1968

Mr. Harold L. Patterson, Principal
Members of the Board
Taholah School District No. 77
P. O. Box 1058
Taholah, Washington 98587

Dear Mr. Patterson and Members of the Board:

May I first of all express my appreciation to you for your thoughtful letter concerning the Taholah school and the schools throughout the State which have a predominantly Indian population. Let me say, too, that I find myself in almost complete agreement with everything you have written. As a matter of fact, many of the points which you make are the same ones I made at the meeting of the State Board of Education in Spokane. Unfortunately, those statements were not included in the newspaper story from which you quote.

I have a strong feeling, and in this the State Board and Mr. Bruno concur, that we must never confuse the problems of de facto segregation of Negroes in the urban centers with the character of the predominantly Indian communities. The reason is obvious. The problems of the central areas in Seattle or Tacoma resulted from the in-migration of Negroes into a predominantly Caucasian culture. In the rural areas, any segregation which exists grew out of the in-migration of whites into Indian communities. In a very real sense, as you so well point out, the Indian treaties of the 1850's and the reservation system played a major role in creating many of the problems with which the Indian population has been confronted.

There was never at any time any discussion by the State Board of Education or by Mr. Bruno or by myself of "abandoning" Taholah or any other school which happens to be predominantly Indian. There was discussion of the desirability of closing some inner-city schools which primarily, because of housing problems, have become predominantly Negro. As you probably know, the Seattle School Board is now giving consideration to such action.

The State Board regulation related to State support for building new facilities says only that funds will not be used when the

new building would "create or aggravate" de facto segregation. An amendment was proposed by a member of the Washington Legislature which would have added the phrase "... but will tend to alleviate racial imbalance within the boundaries of the applicant school district." This amendment was opposed by this Office because it could have affected the predominantly Indian schools as well as the inner-city schools. It would have made it difficult to give assistance to schools like Taholah. On the recommendation of this Office, the State Board unanimously rejected the amendement. Nothing in the new regulation would apply to Taholah.

I think Mr. Bruno's nomination of Taholah as one of the ten best elementary schools in the nation is an indication of the high regard with which this Office holds your school. And certainly the dedication with which you and Mrs. Patterson have served the Taholah community is widely recognized.

This office, under Mr. Bruno's strong leadership, has clung stubbornly to the principle of local control of the public schools. We believe that the ultimate authority must rest with the local community acting through its elected school board and the administrative head appointed by that board. On the other hand, the State constitution assigns to the State Superintendent responsibility for the supervision of the common schools. His role, of course, is to make certain that equal educational opportunities are made available to all children wherever they may live, regardless of their race or national origin.

I am sure we would all agree that we need to strengthen the program offered to the boys and girls in schools like Taholah. You, Mr. Patterson, pointed this out in the excellent study you did at the University of Washington in the summer of 1967. The dropout rate is high. In too many instances in such schools, adequate emphasis is not placed upon the cultural contributions made by Indians to our total civilization. Racial characteristics have too often been disregarded both in the selection of learning resources and in the employment of teaching methods. These may be the unfortunate vestiges of those unhappy decades during which the Indians were regarded and treated as a conquered people.

I am sure Mr. Bruno feels strongly that we must find ways to provide more compensatory educational opportunities for Indian

children. We must continue to seek better ways to build bridges between the two cultures, building mutual respect for one another and the qualities and characteristics inherent in each.

We are planning to have a meeting here in Olympia very soon of those who are in charge of the seventeen schools which serve the majority of our Indian children. The purpose is not in any way to attempt to increase State-level control, but to get your counsel and advice as to how we may assist you in building your programs.

Sincerely,

Chester D. Babcock
Assistant Superintendent
Curriculum and Instruction

CDB:rt
cc: Mr. Louis Bruno
Mr. James Jackson
Mr. Ray Pierce

TAHOLAH
SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 77
Telephone 236-3729
Post Office Box 1058
Taholah, Washington 99597

December 20, 1967

Dr. Chester Babcock
Assistant Supt. of Public Instruction
State of Washington
Olympia, Washington

Dear Dr. Babcock:

Recent news releases from the state office have resulted in a type of publicity for the Taholah School which we feel is harmful. We do not believe that this was your intention, therefore we want to make our position clear so as to avoid a further distortion of the facts.

The Quinault Indians are offended by the type of material which is printed in the enclosed article from the Aberdeen Daily World. The implications of the article are: 1. That the high concentration of Indians in the Taholah School is an abnormal and undesirable thing, 2. That the Indians are involved in the type of racial unrest which characterizes the negro activist movement, 3. That the Indian community is not competent nor worthy to maintain its own school, and 4. That Indians would do better in school if they were forcibly integrated with whites. May we discuss each of the above points?

The concentration of Indians in the Taholah School. The Indian majority in Taholah has existed for thousands of years, according to recent archeological findings. When the Quinault Indian Reservation was created, it was designated for their exclusive use, according to the Quinault Treaty of 1855. The treaty and

Board of Directors
Dave Purdy, Chairman
Alice Chemois, Clerk
Francis McCrory
Harold L. Patterson, Principal

the creation of the reservation did not change the natural state of affairs. The Indians want to live here because this has always been their home. They do not want to give up the reservation to non-Indians, because they gave up most of Grays Harbor County in order to receive a guarantee that they could keep their traditional home. The Quinault Indians have a right to live here, by law, and they believe that they also have a right to have a school. They are not against integration, but they wish to develop and control their own municipal institutions, just as any other normal American community does. When non-Indian children live in Taholah they attend the school without discrimination.

It is our position that the Taholah School is no more segregated than the all-white school in Hoquiam and Aberdeen. There are no problems here that are due to "racial imbalance." We feel that the Taholah School can do a better job of serving its students because the majority are Indian. We have adapted the curriculum to the cultural background of the Indians, with the result that we have full community participation and identification with the school.

The Racial Issue. The Indians of Taholah do not wish to march, riot, participate in civil disobedience, nor burn their draft cards. They are cooperating with all branches of government. They do not wish to be identified with the militant negro minority because they do not feel that their problems are similar. If the Taholah School is "abandoned" as the newspaper suggests, their will be unrest, but it will not be racial unrest. It will be in the form of a united band of citizens who will go to the highest authority in the land to maintain their rights to an education in their own community.

Civic competency. Ethnic counts, surveys, and similar attempts to single out the Indians as being incompetent to determine their own destiny are a move backwards. The Indians have been subjected to bureaueratic control for many years. Now, through the process of local control, they are beginning to take forward steps in self development. Having tasted democracy, they have no desire to go back to bureaucracy, under the State Board of Education or anyone else. The Indian community at Taholah has maintained its own School Board under the state system for many years. We have been progressive, and we take the a great deal of pride in our community school. It is a center of community life, and is a real bridge between the cultures. If allowed to develop naturally, the school will prove to be the real key to integration. If it is abandoned, or integrated

unnaturally, the Indians will withdraw from it, and the results will be the same as in the past.

Integrated schools for Indians. Our public schools teach non-Indian culture. This is their main purpose. Indians raised in their own culture do not learn the cultural patterns as rapidly as non-Indians, but they can learn them. The question is, "How they will learn best?" We have evidence that any child learns best in an accepting environment. When Indians are placed in competition with whites in the field of academics, they tend to withdraw from the field. The teacher with both groups in the classroom has a hard time. The Indians need more individual attention than the more aggressive whites. In a classroom where the majority are Indians, the teaching methods and pace can be geared more readily to the needs of Indian students. Our concern in school is to meet the needs of the individual. We are sure that the individual Indian will do better in school where he has a strong feeling of belonging, and where due recognition is given to the contributions of his own culture to civilization. Taholah has such a school.

At one time there was a community school at La Push. It was abandoned, and the children are bused to Forks. According to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the dropout rate of Indians in the Forks school system has been close to 100%, since the 1940's.

By contrast, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has decided to conduct a large scale experiment at the Rough Rock School in Arizona. They have developed an Indian School under an Indian School Board. The results to date are phenomenal, in terms of the motivation and co-operation of Indian students. The Taholah School has operated on this philosophy for years. We believe we are gaining ground. We are not large, but we are important to our community. We believe we have the answers for Indian education, because we are specialists in the field.

Why, Mr. Babcock, does the state board talk of abandoning such a school without ever having seen it? We are working out solutions to our problems. We have not created any problems for the State of Washington. We have sought the advice and

assistance of the State Department, just as other schools have. We trust that wisdom and consideration will prevail, both in the decisions and in the press releases which issue from the State Board of Education.

We are enclosing a report on the cultural problems of Indian Education for your study. We hope that it will be useful to you.

Sincerely yours,

Taholah School District No. 77

_____
Dave Purdy, Chairman

_____
Alice Chenois, Clerk

_____
Francic McCrory, Director

_____
Harold L. Patterson, Principal

cc: Louis Bruno
Robert Groeschell
James Jackson
Ray Pierce